

Do Assessments Drive Learning? Exploring Nursing Students' Perceptions and Study Approaches: A Cross-Sectional Study

Mohammad Alnaeem, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan

Khaled H. Suleiman, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan



Cover Page Footnote | Note de page couverture

This study received a grant fund for a research project from Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan (2025-2024/897/G12). The authors thank all the nursing students who participated in this study. | Cette étude a reçu une subvention de recherche de la Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan (2025-2024/897/G12). Les auteurs remercient l'ensemble des étudiantes et étudiants qui ont participé à cette étude.

Within contemporary health care systems, nursing professionals serve as core providers of high-quality care across a variety of health care settings (Singh et al., 2024). Nurses are equipped with both theoretical knowledge and advanced clinical competencies (Arteaga et al., 2024). Globally, bridging the gap between theoretical education and its application in clinical practice has been a persistent challenge (Rapport et al., 2022), particularly evident with novice nurses who are learning to decontextualize formal, explicit knowledge in acute care situations (Mahasneh et al., 2021). This discrepancy undermines care quality, hinders nursing's scientific development, perpetuates outdated practices, and may lead to increased nurse attrition (Ominyi & Alabi, 2025).

This theory–practice gap highlights the need for integrated curricula in which theoretical, experiential, self-regulative, and socio-cultural knowledge converge (Van Merriënboer et al., 2024). In response, many higher education institutions have embraced competency-based education (CBE), which emphasizes student-centred, experiential learning in authentic contexts. However, questions remain about whether students, particularly in nursing, build the robust, connected knowledge networks required to transition smoothly into professional roles (Chan et al., 2023). CBE, rooted in constructivist learning theories, advocates for assessments that not only test theoretical knowledge but also foster reflection, metacognition, and the transfer of knowledge to practice (Lee, 2025).

In Jordan, nursing education plays a pivotal role in addressing national health priorities and global workforce demands (Al-Worafi & Alakhali, 2023), attaining a notable status compared to other countries in the region (Khamaiseh & Altarawneh (2023). This development has been supported by the integration of nursing education into university systems (Almukhaini et al., 2022), the introduction of baccalaureate programs, and the establishment of clear entry standards for professional practice (Lewis et al., 2022). However, nursing education still encounters many challenges, including high student-to-faculty ratios, resource limitations, and tensions between traditional and modern teaching strategies (Al-Dweik et al., 2021). In this environment, the alignment of assessments with intended learning outcomes is not only a pedagogical concern but also a strategic priority in preparation for international accreditation of a nursing education program.

Limited empirical studies have explored how assessment design supports the achievement of learning outcomes, particularly from the perspective of students—a group essential for evaluating the quality, fairness, and relevance of assessment tools. Yet, studies have shown that many nursing students struggle to integrate knowledge with real-world clinical expectations, often requiring extended training periods after graduation to acquire essential experiential knowledge (Hatlevik, 2017; Hoeve et al., 2019).

Previous research by Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al. (2019) identified six core dimensions that shape students' perceptions of assessment quality: 1) the impact of assessment on learning, which reflects how assessment supports motivation and learning through mechanisms such as feedback and alignment with learning goals; 2) fairness of assessment, referring to the perceived validity, comparability, and feasibility of assessment demands; 3) assessment conditions, which relate to contextual factors beyond students' control that may influence their performance, such as the manageability and soundness of test administration; 4) interpretation of test scores, concerning the degree to which scores are seen as valid, meaningful, and generalizable indicators of student ability; 5) authenticity of assessment, focusing on the alignment between assessment tasks and real-world professional contexts; and 6) credibility of assessment, which relates to the consistency and trustworthiness of the assessment process from the student's perspective (Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al., 2019). However, limited evidence exists regarding the extent to which students' perceptions of assessment quality—including the six core dimensions—are associated with their learning approaches and outcomes, particularly within the context of nursing education in institutions undergoing international accreditation (Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp

et al., 2019; Tiwari et al., 2005). This issue is especially relevant for universities, such as the private university in Jordan currently seeking Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) accreditation, where alignment between assessment practices and student-centred learning is critical for meeting global standards (Nunn-Ellison et al., 2024). Given that students' perceptions significantly influence their engagement and learning behaviours, relying solely on objective indicators of assessment quality may overlook important experiential insights. Understanding these relationships can inform targeted improvements in assessment design and learning strategies. Therefore, this study seeks to answer the following research question: What is the relationship between undergraduate nursing students' perceptions of assessment quality—including the six identified variables—and their approaches to learning?

Method

Design and Sampling

A cross-sectional study was used. A convenience sampling method was employed to recruit participants. The target population was undergraduate nursing students currently enrolled in the Bachelor of Nursing program at a private university in Jordan. To ensure that participants had sufficient exposure to both theoretical instruction and clinical practice, only students who had successfully completed at least the fourth semester of their nursing studies were eligible to participate. The inclusion criteria were being enrolled in the Bachelor of Nursing program at the private university in Jordan, being 18 years of age or older, having completed at least four semesters (two academic years), and having been exposed to both theoretical and clinical nursing courses. The exclusion criteria included being a first-year student or a student who had not yet completed clinical training components, as well as having a documented writing or communication disability that could impair the ability to complete self-report questionnaires.

Setting

The university is one of the largest private universities in Amman, Jordan. It is actively pursuing accreditation from the ACEN, necessitating a rigorous alignment of assessment practices with internationally recognized quality standards. The study was conducted during the first semester of the academic year 2024–25 (September to December 2024), aligning with ongoing institutional efforts to enhance pedagogical quality and evidence-based curriculum reform. Participants were invited to complete the survey within a defined period following their scheduled academic assessments.

Instruments

A self-administered questionnaire was used to achieve the study's objective. The questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first section included demographic data, such as age, gender, cumulative grade point average (GPA), and academic year.

The second section was the Students' Perceptions of Assessment Quality Questionnaire (SPAQQ). The SPAQQ (see Appendix A) is used to assess undergraduate students' perceptions of assessment quality, based on a developed validated instrument (Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al., 2019). This 39-item questionnaire covers six key dimensions: 1) effects of assessment on learning; 2) fairness; 3) assessment conditions; 4) interpretation of test scores; 5) authenticity; and 6) credibility. Responses were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *completely disagree* to 7 = *completely agree*. To ensure consistency in responses, each page included a brief definition of assessment quality, covering test items, assignment design, assessment tools (e.g., knowledge tests, portfolios), assessor

professionalism, and overall program structure. The instrument demonstrated good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.75 to 0.89.

The third section was the Approaches to Learning and Studying Inventory (ALSI). A shortened version of the ALSI was employed to assess students' learning and studying approaches. This 18-item instrument includes five subscales: 1) deep learning; 2) surface learning; 3) monitoring studying; 4) organized studying; and 5) effort management (Entwistle & McCune, 2004; Entwistle et al., 2002). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *disagree* to 5 = *agree*. The subscales demonstrated acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.30 to 0.72.

Ethical Considerations

This study received ethical approval from the researchers' university in Jordan (No: #7/1/2024-2025). Permission to use the tool was obtained from the original author. Informed consent was obtained from all participants in this study in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Data Collection Process

After obtaining approval from the university and 2 weeks prior to data collection, we sent an informational email describing the study to 1,000 eligible nursing students. Subsequently, students received an email invitation with a link to the questionnaire followed by weekly reminders. When possible, time was offered during class sessions to complete the questionnaires; absent students were encouraged to complete them at home. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained via a consent form embedded in the questionnaire. A total of 765 students (73.9%) responded. Of these responses, 26 were excluded: 12 due to not providing informed consent and 14 due to incomplete responses (more than 50% of items missing). The final sample included in the analysis was 739 participants.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24. Preliminary assumption checks revealed non-normality via the Shapiro–Wilk test for all six SPAQQ subscales ($p < 0.001$) and all three ALSI subscales (deep learning: $p < 0.001$; surface learning: $p = 0.002$; strategic learning: $p = 0.004$). However, given the sufficiently large sample size ($n = 739$), we applied the central limit theorem, allowing for the use of parametric tests. We identified but retained 15 outliers as they represented authentic data points.

We conducted Pearson correlation analyses to examine relationships among students' perceptions of assessment quality (SPAQQ subscales), their approaches to learning (ALSI subscales), and their academic performance (cumulative GPA). Confidence intervals were calculated, and effect sizes were reported following Cohen's (1988) guidelines. Subsequently, we carried out bivariate regression analyses in SPSS to explore the predictive power of overall assessment quality (mean SPAQQ score) on each ALSI subscale and the students' accumulative average. Further multiple regression analyses assessed which specific SPAQQ dimensions most strongly predicted learning approaches and outcomes. Confidence intervals for regression coefficients were computed to enhance interpretability. The significant level was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

A sample of 739 participants was included with a mean age of 21.25 (SD = 3.01), ranging from 18 to 44. Most participants were female (72.7%), and many were in their second year (55.6%) or fourth year (26.4%) of the program. Most participants held a cumulative GPA that was either good (33.2%) or very good (39.5). The majority of participants received university discounts (91.9%) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Demographic and Academic Performance Variables (n = 739)

Demographic variables	n (%)
Age (Mean $\pm$ SD) = 21.25 ($\pm$ 3.01)	
Gender	
Male	202 (27.3)
Female	537 (72.7)
Academic year	
Second	411 (55.6)
Third	133 (18)
Fourth	195 (26.4)
Cumulative GPA	
Accepted	66 (8.9)
Good	245 (33.2)
Very good	292 (39.5)
Excellent	136 (18.4)

The Relationship Between Students' Perceptions of Assessment Quality and Their Learning Approaches

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis indicated a strong positive correlation between all dimensions of perceived assessment quality and overall learning approaches ($r = 0.767$; $p < 0.001$). For the perceived effects of assessment on learning, positive correlations were identified with deep learning ($r = 0.639$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.485$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.616$, $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.567$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.563$; $p < 0.001$) (see Table 2).

In terms of perceived fairness of assessment, the analysis revealed a positive correlation with deep learning ($r = 0.665$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.475$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.599$; $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.547$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.534$; $p < 0.001$). Regarding perceived assessment quality as conditions of assessment, the results illustrated a positive

correlation with deep learning ($r = 0.695$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.496$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.612$; $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.570$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.606$; $p < 0.001$).

For perceived assessment quality as interpretation of test scores, a positive correlation was found with deep learning ($r = 0.621$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.526$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.561$; $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.505$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.568$; $p < 0.001$).

Concerning perceived assessment quality as authenticity of assessment, the results demonstrated a positive correlation with deep learning ($r = 0.752$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.539$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.673$; $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.611$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.634$; $p < 0.001$). Lastly, for perceived assessment quality as credibility of assessment, positive correlations were observed with the deep learning ($r = 0.783$; $p < 0.001$), surface learning ($r = 0.565$; $p < 0.001$), monitoring studying ($r = 0.692$; $p < 0.001$), organized studying ($r = 0.638$; $p < 0.001$), and effort management ($r = 0.749$; $p < 0.001$).

Table 2

Correlation Between Perception of Assessment Quality and Their Learning Approaches (n = 739)

Variable	ALSI: Deep learning		ALSI: Surface learning		ALSI: Monitoring studying		ALSI: Organized studying		ALSI: Effort management		Total ALSI score	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
SPAQQ1: Effects of assessment on learning	0.639	< 0.001	0.485	< 0.001	0.616	< 0.001	0.567	< 0.001	0.563	< 0.001	0.679	< 0.001
SPAQQ2: Fairness of assessment	0.665	< 0.001	0.475	< 0.001	0.599	< 0.001	0.547	< 0.001	0.534	< 0.001	0.673	< 0.001
SPAQQ3: Conditions of assessment	0.695	< 0.001	0.496	< 0.001	0.612	< 0.001	0.570	< 0.001	0.606	< 0.001	0.707	< 0.001
SPAQQ4: Interpretation of test scores	0.621	< 0.001	0.526	< 0.001	0.561	< 0.001	0.505	< 0.001	0.568	< 0.001	0.661	< 0.001
SPAQQ5: Authenticity of assessment	0.752	< 0.001	0.539	< 0.001	0.673	< 0.001	0.611	< 0.001	0.634	< 0.001	0.746	< 0.001
SPAQQ6: Credibility of assessment	0.783	< 0.001	0.565	< 0.001	0.692	< 0.001	0.638	< 0.001	0.749	< 0.001	0.788	< 0.001
Total SPAQQ score	0.735	< 0.001	0.570	< 0.001	0.676	< 0.001	0.614	< 0.001	0.619	< 0.001	0.767	< 0.001

Predictors of Students' Perceptions of Assessment Quality

We conducted a multiple regression analysis to examine the predictive relationship between six subscales of the SPAQQ and the deep learning approach. The overall model exhibited statistical significance, $F(9, 636) = 108.11, p < 0.001$, with an R^2 value of 0.61. Among the variables, three were identified as significant predictors: effects of assessment ($\beta = 0.09, p = 0.044$), authenticity ($\beta = 0.24, p < 0.001$), and credibility ($\beta = 0.51, p < 0.001$). The variables of fairness, conditions, and interpretation did not demonstrate statistically significant predictive power (see Table 3). In a separate analysis, the surface learning approach was also predicted using the six subscales. The model was found to be statistically significant, $F(9, 636) = 41.57, p < 0.001$, with an R^2 of 0.37. Two variables emerged as significant predictors: interpretation of test scores ($\beta = 0.20, p < 0.001$) and credibility ($\beta = 0.37, p < 0.001$). The remaining variables—effects of assessment, fairness, authenticity, and conditions—did not exhibit statistical significance.

Further, we carried out a multiple regression analysis to predict the monitoring studying approach based on the six SPAQQ subscales. The model was significant, $F(9, 636) = 71.16, p < 0.001$, with an R^2 value of 0.50. The significant predictors included effects of assessment ($\beta = 0.19, p < 0.001$), authenticity ($\beta = 0.25, p < 0.001$), and credibility ($\beta = 0.37, p < 0.001$), while fairness, conditions, and interpretation were not statistically significant predictors.

Additionally, we performed a multiple regression analysis to predict the organized studying approach. The overall model proved to be significant, $F(9, 636) = 46.89, p < 0.001$, with an R^2 of 0.40. We identified three significant predictors: effects of assessment ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.001$), authenticity ($\beta = 0.25, p < 0.001$), and credibility ($\beta = 0.21, p < 0.001$). Fairness, conditions, and interpretation did not yield statistical significance in this context.

Lastly, we conducted a multiple regression analysis to predict the effort management approach from the six SPAQQ subscales. The model was significant, $F(9, 636) = 50.89, p < 0.001$, with an R^2 value of 0.42. All predictors were deemed significant except for interpretation of test scores: effects of assessment ($\beta = 0.21, p < 0.001$), fairness ($\beta = 0.22, p = 0.001$), conditions ($\beta = 0.18, p = 0.002$), authenticity ($\beta = 0.20, p = 0.008$), and credibility ($\beta = 0.27, p < 0.001$).

Table 3

Predictors of Students' Perceptions of Assessment

Predictors	Deep learning			Surface learning			Monitoring studying			Organizing studying			Effort management		
	R ²	β	p	R ²	β	p	R ²	β	p	R ²	β	p	R ²	β	p
Effects of assessment on learning	0.61	0.09	0.044	0.37	0.045	0.437	0.50	0.19	< 0.001	0.40	0.22	< 0.001	0.42	0.21	< 0.001
Fairness of assessment		0.003	0.959		-0.03	0.685		0.05	0.398		-0.06	0.367		-0.22	0.001
Conditions of assessment		-0.01	0.867		-0.03	0.658		-0.11	0.089		0.05	0.507		0.18	0.012
Interpretation of test scores		-0.03	0.465		0.20	< 0.001		-0.01	0.751		0.001	0.976		0.06	0.226
Authenticity of assessment		0.24	< 0.001		0.10	0.189		0.254	< 0.001		0.254	0.001		0.20	0.008
Credibility of assessment		0.51	< 0.001		0.37	< 0.001		0.368	< 0.001		0.214	0.001		0.27	< 0.001
Academic year		-0.01	0.705		-0.01	0.750		-0.03	0.348		-0.02	0.538		-0.06	0.044
Gender		-0.004	0.867		0.05	0.114		0.03	0.380		0.01	0.733		0.03	0.397
Accumulative average		0.07	0.007		-0.04	0.249		0.07	0.021		0.06	0.07		0.03	0.302

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between undergraduate nursing students' perceptions of assessment quality and their approaches to learning within the context of a private university in Jordan undergoing ACEN accreditation. The findings support and expand upon prior international research by demonstrating strong positive correlations between all six dimensions of perceived assessment quality and various learning approaches (Delli Poggi et al., 2021; Engström et al., 2017; Miguel et al., 2018), with particularly strong associations among credibility, authenticity, and effects of assessment and the deep, strategic, and self-regulated learning strategies.

Consistent with Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al. (2019), our results confirmed that students' overall positive perceptions of assessment quality were significantly related to deeper and more-organized learning approaches. Specifically, credibility of assessment emerged as the strongest predictor across almost all learning strategies, suggesting that when students trust the fairness, transparency, and consistency of evaluation systems, they are more likely to engage in meaningful, effortful, and metacognitive learning behaviours (Conijn et al., 2023; Dolan et al., 2019; Kastania, 2024). This finding reinforces the importance of cultivating student trust in assessment systems, particularly in educational cultures like Jordan's, where hierarchical structures and exam-centred curricula have traditionally limited students' autonomy in the learning process (Farahat, 2022; Ghaleb, 2024).

Moreover, the authenticity of assessment—a key indicator of how well assessments align with real-world professional tasks—was also a significant predictor of the deep learning, monitoring studying, and organized studying approaches. This finding aligns with international evidence showing that students are more likely to value and engage with assessments they perceive as relevant to future practice (Aladwani et al., 2024; Ricci et al., 2022; Saleh et al., 2025). In the context of Jordanian nursing education, where the integration of clinical competence and theoretical knowledge is essential for licensure and workforce readiness (Abunab et al., 2024; Al Hadid et al., 2023; Almaaytah & Alnaeem, 2025; Alnaeem et al., 2024; Fathi & Ibrahim, 2023), these findings highlight the urgent need for assessment reforms that reflect real-life clinical decision-making and interdisciplinary collaboration (Körgemaa et al., 2024; Nunn-Elison et al., 2024).

Unlike prior studies that found limited or no associations between some variables (e.g., fairness, conditions, and interpretation) and learning outcomes (Baniasadi et al., 2023; Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et al., 2019), our results demonstrated statistically significant correlations between all six SPAQQ variables and learning strategies in bivariate analyses. For instance, fairness was significantly associated with deep and effortful learning in the correlation analysis but did not retain predictive strength in most regression models. This finding suggests that while students may perceive these dimensions as influential, their motivational impact may be moderated by stronger predictors such as credibility and authenticity (Kianinezhad, 2023).

Another notable contrast is the predictive role of the interpretation of test scores dimension in surface learning. This suggests that unclear or overly ambiguous interpretations may inadvertently encourage rote memorization and exam-oriented studying (Ghaleb, 2024; Gharaibeh et al., 2022), a concern especially relevant in Jordan's examination-driven academic culture. Students may resort to surface strategies when test results lack transparency or alignment with stated learning goals (Al-Dweik et al., 2021), reinforcing the need for better feedback practices and score-reporting systems in local institutions.

The consistent correlations between perceptions of assessment quality and all five learning approaches indicate a more unified perception among Jordanian nursing students than previously observed in European contexts (Al-Dweik et al., 2021; Aladwani et al., 2024; Shudifat et al., 2024). This finding could reflect a higher sensitivity to assessment fairness and credibility in a context in which formal assessment outcomes are closely related to academic progression and future employment. Furthermore, in institutions undergoing accreditation by bodies such as ACEN, where assessment practices are under reform, students may be more attuned to changes and their implications for their academic trajectories (Nunn-Ellison et al., 2024).

Our findings carry several implications for assessment design and institutional policy. First, enhancing the credibility and authenticity of assessment tools is likely to promote deeper learning engagement. This can be achieved by embedding real-world scenarios into assessments, training faculty on transparent grading criteria, and ensuring consistency across evaluators. Second, students' perceptions must be routinely gathered and triangulated with other evaluation data to inform continual improvement in teaching and assessment practices. Third, educators should be aware that students' trust in assessment directly shapes their willingness to invest cognitively and emotionally in learning.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several strengths. It employed validated and comprehensive tools to measure students' perceptions of assessment quality and their approaches to learning. The large sample size enhanced the statistical power of the analysis. Additionally, the study was conducted in a private university undergoing ACEN accreditation, which reflects adherence to internationally recognized standards for nursing education. This context captures students' perceptions within an environment actively engaged in quality assurance, curriculum evaluation, and evidence-based educational reform, thereby enhancing the applicability of the findings to institutional improvement efforts.

However, the study has some limitations. First, the study was conducted at a single private university, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other academic institutions or public universities. Second, the findings should be interpreted within the cultural context of Jordan, where hierarchical educational structures and exam-oriented curricula may influence students' perceptions of assessment. As the study relies on self-reported measures, such contextual factors may introduce subjectivity and affect how students interpret and respond to survey items. Third, the study lacked objective academic performance data (e.g., GPA or course grades), which could have been used to triangulate self-reported learning outcomes. Fourth, the study did not assess potential moderating or mediating variables (such as motivation or self-efficacy), which may influence or explain the relationship between students' perceptions and learning approaches.

We recommend that future studies involve multiple institutions across diverse regions and educational settings, including both public and private universities, to improve the generalizability and broader applicability of the findings. In addition, further studies should include objective academic outcome measures and examine underlying psychological or contextual factors to gain deeper insight into how assessment perceptions shape learning behaviours.

Conclusion

In the context of Jordan's higher education reforms and global accreditation efforts, this study provides timely evidence that students' perceptions of assessment quality are meaningful and significantly associated with how they approach learning. Strengthening assessment credibility and authenticity appears crucial for fostering strategic and self-regulated learning behaviours among nursing students. These insights may inform faculty development, institutional self-studies, and the redesign of assessment frameworks aligned with international standards such as those promoted by ACEN.

References

- Abunab, H. Y., Mrayyan, M. T., Alfayoumi, I., Algunmeeyn, A., & Alzaatreh, M. Y. (2024). Global health competencies of undergraduate nursing students in Jordan. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 45(4), E22–E24. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000001256>
- Al Hadid, L. A., Al Barmawi, M., Al Farajat, L., & Alnjadat, R. (2023). The effect of a clinical training course on new nursing graduates' knowledge, skills, self-efficacy, and willingness to care for COVID-19 patients using simulation. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, 19, 100626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2023.100626>
- Al-Dweik, G., Khalil, H., Atout, M., Al Zaghmouri, A., & AbuRuz, M. E. (2021). Undergraduate nursing student perspectives about challenges in clinical education in Jordan: A cross-sectional descriptive study. *The Open Nursing Journal*, 15(1), 285–290. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874434602115010285>
- Al-Worafi, Y. M., & Alakhali, K. M. (2023). Healthcare workforce issues in developing countries: Nursing. In Y. M. Al-Worafi, *Handbook of medical and health sciences in developing countries: Education, practice, and research* (pp. 1–22). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74786-2_214-1
- Aladwani, M. A., Hindi, A. M., Wakefield, A. B., Willis, S. C., & Hall, J. (2024). Exploring UK undergraduate healthcare students' perspectives on how to effectively design IPE: A qualitative study. *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences*, 19(2), 304–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtumed.2023.12.006>
- Almaaytah, N., & Alnaeem, M. M. (2025). Examining midwifery students' awareness, perception, and attitudes toward the integration of social media into midwifery clinical education: A cross-sectional study from a nursing school in Jordan. *Nursing and Midwifery Studies*, 14(1), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.48307/nms.2024.449090.1381>
- Almukhaini, S., Weeks, L. E., Macdonald, M., Martin-Misener, R., Al Ismaili, Z., Macdonald, D., Al-Fahdi, N., Al-Rasbi, S., Nasaif, H., & Rothfus, M. A. (2022). Advanced practice nursing roles in Arab countries in the Eastern Mediterranean region: A scoping review. *JB I Evidence Synthesis*, 20(5), 1209–1242. <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-21-00101>
- Alnaeem, M. M., Atallah, A. A., Alhadidi, M., Salameh, I., Al-Mugheed, K., Alzoubi, M. M., Alabdullah, A. A. S., & Abdelaliem, S. M. F. (2024). Relationship between perceived value, attitudes, and academic motivation in distance learning among nursing students in rural areas. *BMC Nursing*, 23(1), Article 710. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02354-5>
- Arteaga, E., Biesbroek, R., Nalau, J., & Howes, M. (2024). Across the great divide: A systematic literature review to address the gap between theory and practice. *Sage Open*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241228019>
- Baniasadi, A., Salehi, K., Khodaie, E., Bagheri Noaparast, K., & Izanloo, B. (2023). Fairness in classroom assessment: A systematic review. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 32, 91–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00636-z>
- Chan, R. J., Knowles, R., Hunter, S., Conroy, T., Tieu, M., & Kitson, A. (2023). From evidence-based practice to knowledge translation: What is the difference? What are the roles of nurse leaders? *Seminars in Oncology Nursing*, 39(1), 151363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2022.151363>

- Conijn, R., Kahr, P., & Snijders, C. C. (2023). The effects of explanations in automated essay scoring systems on student trust and motivation. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 10(1), 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/tgpf4>
- Delli Poggi, A., Pintus, G., Dionisi, S., Di Simone, E., Giannetta, N., Di Muzio, M., Mardente, S., Tibaldi, L., Tartaglini, D., & Consorti, F. (2021). Impact of nursing students on the quality of care perceived by patients: A systematic review of the literature. *European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences*, 25(6), 2711–2725. https://doi.org/10.26355/eurev_202103_25434
- Dolan, B. M., Arnold, J., & Green, M. M. (2019). Establishing trust when assessing learners: barriers and opportunities. *Academic Medicine*, 94(12), 1851–1853. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002982>
- Engström, M., Löfmark, A., Vae, K. J. U., & Mårtensson, G. (2017). Nursing students' perceptions of using the clinical education assessment tool AssCE and their overall perceptions of the clinical learning environment: A cross-sectional correlational study. *Nurse Education Today*, 51, 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.01.009>
- Entwistle, N., & McCune, V. (2004). The conceptual bases of study strategy inventories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0003-0>
- Entwistle, N., McCune, V., & Hounsell, J. (2002, September). *Approaches to studying and perceptions of university teaching-learning environments: Concepts, measures and preliminary findings*. ETL Project. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33594.80329>
- Farahat, A. (2022). Elements of academic integrity in a cross-cultural middle eastern educational system: Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan case study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18(1), Article 9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00095-5>
- Fathi, K. Y., & Ibrahim, R. H. (2023). Factors influencing integration of theory into practice in clinical skills acquisition among nursing students. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, 37, 101181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imu.2023.101181>
- Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp, K. J., Joosten-Ten Brinke, D., & Kester, L. (2019). Students' perceptions of assessment quality related to their learning approaches and learning outcomes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 63, 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.07.005>
- Ghaleb, B. D. S. (2024). Effect of exam-focused and teacher-centered education systems on students' cognitive and psychological competencies. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach Research and Science*, 2(2), 611–631. <https://doi.org/10.59653/ijmars.v2i02.648>
- Gharaibeh, B., Abuhammad, S., & Akhu-Zaheya, L. (2022). Attitudes toward physical examination skills among registered nurses in clinical settings in Jordan. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, 32, 101027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imu.2022.101027>
- Hatlevik, I. K. R. (2017). The impact of prospective teachers' perceived competence on subsequent perceptions as schoolteachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(7), 810–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1322056>
- Hoeve, A., Kuijer-Siebelink, W., & Nieuwenhuis, L. (2019). Innovative work-based learning for responsive vocational education and training (VET): Lessons from Dutch higher VET. In D. Guille & L. Unwin (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of vocational education and training* (pp. 415–432). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119098713.ch21>

- Kastania, N. P. P. (2024). Building trust in AI education: Addressing transparency and ensuring trustworthiness. In D. Kourkoulou, A. O. Tzirides, B. Cope, & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Trust and inclusion in AI-mediated education: Where human learning meets learning machines* (pp. 73–90). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64487-0_4
- Khamaiseh, A. M., & Altarawneh, F. Z. (2023). Factors and barriers influencing practice of health education among nursing students in Jordan. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 12(1), 441. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_165_23
- Kianinezhad, N. (2023). A theoretical exploration of teacher credibility and immediacy as influential factors in learning and teaching. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 4(3), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls.v4i3.817>
- Körgemaa, U., Sisask, M., & Ernits, Ü. (2024). Nurses retrospective view on nursing education: A repeated cross-sectional study over three decades. *Heliyon*, 10(4), e26211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26211>
- Lee, C. J. (2025). *The role of metacognition within undergraduate nursing education: A scoping review* [Master's thesis, University of Calgary]. Scholaris. <https://ucalgary.scholaris.ca/items/95936c83-48af-440a-b9aa-4e487a0f1427>
- Lewis, L. S., Rebesch, L. M., & Hunt, E. (2022). Nursing education practice update 2022: Competency-based education in nursing. *Sage Open Nursing*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608221140774>
- Mahasneh, D., Shoqirat, N., Alsaraireh, A., Singh, C., & Thorpe, L. (2021). From learning on mannequins to practicing on patients: Nursing students' first-time experience of clinical placement in Jordan. *Sage Open Nursing*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608211004298>
- Miguel, E. M., Ruiz, M. S., Blas, E., & Perea, C. M. (2018). Competency assessment impact in quality of learning: Nursing degree learner's and teacher's perception. *Enfermería Global*, 50, 420–433. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/eglobal.17.2.263041>
- Nunn-Ellison, K., Tillson, M., Farmer, S., Ard, N., & Polk, L. (2024). The ACEN 2023 standards and impact of accreditation on the quality of nursing education. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 19(2), 108–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2023.12.016>
- Ominyi, J., & Alabi, A. (2025). Bridging barriers to evidence-based practice and knowledge utilisation: Leadership strategies in acute care nursing. *Hospitals*, 2(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/hospitals2010004>
- Rapport, F., Smith, J., Hutchinson, K., Clay-Williams, R., Churruca, K., Bierbaum, M., & Braithwaite, J. (2022). Too much theory and not enough practice? The challenge of implementation science application in healthcare practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 28(6), 991–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13600>
- Ricci, L., Villegente, J., Loyal, D., Ayav, C., Kivits, J., & Rat, A.-C. (2022). Tailored patient therapeutic educational interventions: A patient-centred communication model. *Health Expectations*, 25(1), 276–289. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13377>

- Saleh, Z. T., Rababa, M., Elshatarat, R. A., Alharbi, M., Alhumaidi, B. N., Al-Za'areer, M. S., Jarrad, R. A., Al Niarat, T. F., Almagharbeh, W. T., Al-Sayaghi, K. M., & Fadila, D. E. S. (2025). Exploring faculty perceptions and concerns regarding artificial intelligence Chatbots in nursing education: Potential benefits and limitations. *BMC Nursing*, 24(1), Article 440. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03082-0>
- Shudifat, R., Algunaameyn, A., Mahasneh, D., Al-Oran, H., Alduraiddi, H., & Shosha, G. A. (2024). Nursing students' perceptions of the qualities of clinical instructors in a public university in Jordan: A qualitative study. *Belitung Nursing Journal*, 10(4), 481. <https://doi.org/10.33546/bnj.3469>
- Singh, K., Alomari, A. M. A., Sayed, H. M. A., Mannethodi, K., Kunjavara, J., Joy, G. V., Hassan, N., Martinez, E., & Lenjawi, B. A. (2024). Barriers and solutions to the gap between theory and practice in nursing services: A systematic review of qualitative evidence. *Nursing Forum*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/7522900>
- Tiwari, A., Lam, D., Yuen, K., Chan, R., Fung, T., & Chan, S. (2005). Student learning in clinical nursing education: Perceptions of the relationship between assessment and learning. *Nurse Education Today*, 25(4), 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2005.01.013>
- Van Merriënboer, J. J., Kirschner, P. A., & Frèrejean, J. (2024). *Ten steps to complex learning: A systematic approach to four-component instructional design*. Routledge.

Appendix A: Students' Perceptions of Assessment Quality Questionnaire (SPAQQ)

Item	Completely disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Completely agree (7)
1. Testing and assessment have a positive effect on my learning.							
2. Testing and assessment add value to the time I have spent on the work done.							
3. Testing and assessment are valuable instances of learning in their own right.							
4. Testing and assessment motivate me to continue learning.							
5. Testing and assessment help me to navigate my own learning process.							
6. Testing and assessment are geared towards the retention of my competencies in the longer run.							
7. Testing and assessment prepare me well for future learning activities.							

8. Testing and assessment give me the confidence to continue learning.							
9. The tests are challenging.							
10. When I get feedback on tests, it shows clearly what I have not yet mastered.							
11. When I get feedback on tests, it shows clearly what I have already mastered.							
12. The tests correspond with the learning targets.							
13. Testing and assessment are the same for all students in my year.							
14. Testing and assessment are fair.							
15. Testing and assessment can be done in the time given.							
16. The difficulty of testing and assessment concur with the level of my education.							
17. The tests and assessments are organized well.							
18. Tests have been spread out evenly during the periods set for testing in the year of study.							

19. When I get feedback on my tests, I will receive it in time.							
20. The team of teachers in my educational program are accomplished in testing and assessment.							
21. All tests feature correct language.							
22. During testing and assessments there are no disturbing external factors, such as fraudulent behaviour.							
23. Whether I pass or fail is based correctly on the score of a test I have taken.							
24. Tests have been constructed with care.							
25. My scores on tests reflect the extent to which I have mastered the subject.							
26. My scores on various tests on the same topic are comparable.							
27. I would score the same for a test if different questions or tasks about the same							

subject were presented to me.							
28. I would get more or less the same score on a test if I took the test for a second time (supposing my understanding of the subject matter has remained the same).							
29. Testing and assessment correspond with the activities I will have to perform in my future occupation.							
30. I understand testing and assessment.							
31. The circumstances in which I am tested or assessed are similar to the working conditions of my future profession.							
32. Testing and assessment unveil my thinking processes, for instance when I am asked to underpin certain choices.							
33. I need the competences I require to pass my tests in other (professional) situations as well.							

34. I agree with the manner in which I am examined.							
35. The teachers use the results of the tests and assessments to adjust the teaching.							
36. Judgements are made independently of the persons who rate me.							
37. Assessments are made independently of the situations I am assessed in.							
38. I trust testing and assessment in my educational program to be of good quality.							
39. I get actively involved in testing and assessment in my educational program.							